

Pacific Northwest Utility Planning Processes

Utility	Open Door Planning Process
Idaho Power	Yes
Puget Sound Energy	Yes
Portland General Electric	Yes
Avista (ID, WA)	Yes
PacifiCorps (UT, WY, ID, OR)	Yes
NorthWestern Energy	No

The following are excerpts from recent Integrated Resource Plan's for major utilities in the Pacific Northwest. See Appendix A for lists of participants in these planning processes. All emphasis added.

Idaho Power

"The **public forum** is known as the IRP Advisory Council (IRPAC). The IRPAC meets most months during the development of the resource plan, and the meetings are open to the public. Members of the council include regulatory, political, environmental, and customer representatives, as well as representatives of other public-interest groups. Many members of the public also participate even though they are not members of the IRPAC. Some individuals have participated in Idaho Power's resource planning process for over 20 years...Idaho Power believes working with members of the IRPAC and the public improves the IRP."¹

Puget Sound Energy

"PSE is committed to **public involvement in the planning process**. Stakeholder meetings generated valuable constructive feedback, and the suggestions and practical information we received from both organizations and individuals helped guide the development of the 2015 IRP. We wish to thank all who participated."²

Portland General Electric

"PGE's integrated resource planning **public process** is a collaboration of multiple parties, including customers, regulators, stakeholders, and independent consultants. Throughout the planning process, PGE shares the results of related research, analyses and findings with participating parties."³

¹ Idaho Power 2017 IRP, page 3.

² 2015 PSE IRP, Appendix A page A-1.

³ PGE 2016 IRP, page 56.

Avista

“Avista actively seeks input from a variety of constituents through the TAC [Technical Advisory Committee]. The TAC is a mix of over 75 invited external participants, including staff from the Idaho and Washington commissions, customers, academics, environmental organizations, government agencies, consultants, utilities, and other interested parties, who joined the planning process. [...] We continue to expand TAC membership and diversity, and maintain the TAC meetings as an **open public process**.”⁴

PacifiCorps

“Stakeholders have been involved in the development of the 2017 IRP from the beginning. The **public input meetings** (PIM) held beginning in June 2016 were the cornerstone of the direct public input process. There were a total of seven PIM, with four lasting two days, the remainder being single days. Meetings were held jointly in both Salt Lake City, Utah and Portland, Oregon via video conference, with expanded video conference locations in Denver, Colorado and Cheyenne, Wyoming. One meeting was held via phone conference. For all meetings, attendees off-site for were able to conference in via phone.”⁵

⁴ Avista 2015 Electric IRP Electric IRP, page 2-1 and 2-4.

⁵ 2017 PacifiCorps IRP. Volume II, page 57.

APPENDIX A

Idaho Power 2017 IRP

Idaho Power Company

IRP Advisory Council

IRP ADVISORY COUNCIL

Idaho Power has involved representatives of the public in the IRP planning process since the early 1990s. This public forum is known as the IRP Advisory Council (IRPAC). The IRPAC generally meets monthly during the development of the IRP, and the meetings are open to the public. Members of the council include regulatory, political, environmental, and customer representatives, as well as representatives of other public-interest groups.

Idaho Power hosted 8 IRPAC meetings, including a workshop designed to explore the potential for distributed energy resources to defer grid investment. Idaho Power values these opportunities to convene, and the IRPAC members and the public have made significant contributions to this plan.

Idaho Power believes working with members of the IRPAC and the public is rewarding, and the IRP is better because of public involvement. Idaho Power and the members of the IRPAC recognize outside perspective is valuable, but also understand that final decisions on the IRP are made by Idaho Power.

Customer Representatives

Agricultural Representative	Sid Erwin
Boise State University	Barry Burbank
Idaho National Laboratory	Kurt Myers
Micron	Clancy Kelley
Simplot	Don Sturtevant

Public Interest Representatives

Boise Metro Chamber of Commerce	Ray Stark
Boise State University Energy Policy Institute	David Solan
City of Boise	Steve Burgos
Idaho Conservation League	Ben Otto
Idaho Legislature	Representative Robert Anderst
Idaho Office of Energy and Mineral Resources	John Chatburn/Scott Pugrud
Idaho Sierra Club	Mike Heckler/Zack Waterman/Casey Mattoon
Idaho Technology Council	Jay Larsen
Idaho Water Resource Board	Roger Chase
Northwest Power and Conservation Council	Shirley Lindstrom/Jim Yost
Oil and Gas Industry Advisor	David Hawk
Oregon State University—Malheur Experiment Station	Clint Shock
Snake River Alliance	Wendy Wilson/Chad Worth
University of Idaho Center for Ecohydraulics Research	Daniele Tonina

Idaho Power 2017 IRP (Continued)

IRP Advisory Council

Idaho Power Company

Regulatory Commission Representatives

Idaho Public Utilities Commission

Stacey Donohue

Public Utility Commission of Oregon

Nadine Hanhan

IRP Advisory Council Meeting Schedule and Agenda

Meeting Dates		Agenda Items
2016	Thursday, September 8	Introductions/meeting overview Welcome and opening remarks IRP process explanation Pilot projects update Clean Power Plan update Natural gas forecast
2016	Thursday, October 13	Review of September IRPAC meeting T&D deferral benefit Demand-side resources Streamflow forecast Hydro production forecast
2016	Thursday, November 10	Review of October IRPAC meeting Transmission system overview Boardman-Hemingway/Gateway West update Load forecast Contract purchased power forecast
2016	Thursday, December 19	Deferral of Distribution Investment Workshop
2017	Thursday, January 12	Review of November IRPAC meeting Energy efficiency potential study Recap/review Resource stack of IRP resources Final load and resource balance Resource portfolio design
2017	Thursday, March 9	Review of January IRPAC meeting Revisit of natural gas price forecast AURORA and portfolio analysis NW Power and Conservation Council Regional Perspective Flexibility analysis 500 kV transmission projects update Overview of remaining steps
2017	Thursday, April 13	Review of March IRPAC meeting Stochastic risk analysis results Demand response as a resource Resource stack costs – IRP resources Qualitative risk analysis discussion Closing-remaining schedule

Avista Corp 2015 IRP

Chapter 2- Introduction and Stakeholder Involvement

Avista greatly appreciates the valuable contributions of its TAC members and wishes to acknowledge and thank the organizations that allow their attendance. Table 2.2 is a list of the organizations participating in the 2015 IRP TAC process.

Table 2.2: External Technical Advisory Committee Participating Organizations

Organization
AEG
As You Sow
Birch Energy Economics
City of Spokane
Clearwater Paper
Earth Justice
Eastern Washington University
Eugene Water & Electric Board
GE Energy
Gonzaga University
Grant PUD
Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
Idaho Public Utilities Commission
Inland Empire Paper
Montana Environmental Information Center
NW Energy Coalition
PacifiCorp
Pend Oreille PUD
Puget Sound Energy
Pullman City Council
Renewable Northwest
Residential and Small Commercial Customers
Resource Development Associates
Sierra Club
Spokane Neighborhood Action Partners
The Energy Authority
Washington State Office of the Attorney General
Washington Department of Enterprise Services
Washington State Department of Commerce
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
Whitman County Commission

Issue Specific Public Involvement Activities

In addition to TAC meetings, Avista sponsors and participates in several other collaborative processes involving a range of public interests. A sampling is below.

Energy Efficiency Advisory Group

The energy efficiency Advisory Group provides stakeholders and public groups biannual opportunities to discuss Avista's energy efficiency efforts.

Puget Sound Energy 2017 IRP Draft

Appendix A: Public Participation



Stakeholders who actively participated in one or more meetings include:

- WUTC policy staff and advocacy staff
- Washington State Office of the Attorney General
- Northwest Industrial Gas Users (NWIGU)
- Northwest Gas Association (NWGA)
- Northwest Pipeline
- The NW Energy Coalition (NWECC)
- The Sierra Club
- The Northwest Power and Conservation Council
- The City of Bellevue
- The Washington State Department of Commerce
- Project developers, including UET, Pascoe Energy Consulting LLC, Invenergy
- Renewable Northwest (RNW)
- Coalition of Eastside Neighborhoods for Sensible Energy (CENSE)
- King County
- Other utilities
- PSE customers

The following pages briefly describe the purpose of the IRPAG and list the formal IRPAG meetings held. Meeting agendas, presentations and notes are published on the PSE website at <http://pse.com/aboutpse/EnergySupply/Pages/Resource-Planning.aspx>.

Portland General Electric 2016 IRP

Chapter 2. IRP Public Process - 2.3 2016 IRP Public Process

provides a detailed description of the Company's compliance with all pertinent IRP guidelines. Likewise, Appendix B, PGE's Compliance with 2013 IRP Order (Order 14-415), shows that PGE fulfilled all the requirements of its 2013 IRP acknowledgment order.

2.3 2016 IRP Public Process

The public phase of the 2016 IRP started in the spring of 2015. Between April 2015 and November 2016, PGE:

- Conducted *nine* public meetings or roundtables
- Participated in *two* meetings with the OPUC Commissioners
- Provided responses to over 100 parking lot or feedback questions from stakeholders.

Public meeting Roundtable presentations are available online at www.portlandgeneral.com/irp

In compliance with Order No. 14-415, PGE discussed portfolio development at four of the eight meetings.

Participants in PGE's public meetings included representatives from the following organizations:

- AB Saroka Energy
- Bonneville Environmental Foundation (BEF)
- Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)
- Cardno
- Citizens' Utility Board (CUB)
- Cleantech Law Partners
- Converge, Inc.
- Small Business Utility Advocates
- City of Portland Bureau of Planning & Sustainability
- Energy Trust of Oregon (Energy Trust)
- EQL Energy
- General Electric Company (GE)
- Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities (ICNU)
- NW Energy Coalition (NVEC)
- Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NWPPCC)
- Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE)
- Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
- Oregon Public Utility Commission (OPUC)

Portland General Electric 2016 IRP (Continued)

Chapter 2. IRP Public Process • 2.4 Regional Planning Participation

- PacifiCorp dba Pacific Power
- Perennial Power Holdings, Inc.
- Renewable Northwest (RNW)
- Sierra Club
- Sumitomo Electric Industries, Inc.
- SunPower
- Williams Northwest Pipeline

The public meetings and technical workshops included discussion of the following resource planning building blocks, among other topics:

- Load-resource balance (future energy and capacity requirements)
- Capacity Contribution of renewables
- Flexible capacity needs
- Fuel market fundamentals and forecasts (natural gas and coal)
- Energy and capacity resource options, including demand-side and supply-side resources, and energy storage
- Federal and state policy developments, including the Clean Power Plan and Oregon Senate Bill 1547
- Transmission and natural gas transportation considerations
- Modeling approaches and IRP risk metrics.

See Appendix C, Public Process Agendas, for a detailed description of topics covered in PGE's public process.

Throughout the 2016 IRP public process, the Company received valuable stakeholder feedback. PGE used this feedback to develop multiple portfolios designed to meet the Company's incremental capacity and energy needs. PGE also created an online feedback form to provide public stakeholders a convenient method for submitting suggested portfolio options to PGE, or any other comments regarding PGE's 2016 IRP.

2.4 Regional Planning Participation

PGE tracks or participates in nearly 30 regional forums that help inform its planning process. The Company joins in these forums to remain aware of—as well as to guide and shape—regional initiatives focused on resource planning and utility operations. PGE is also able to identify and influence emerging issues and policy developments that could positively or negatively impact future portfolio choices.